

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF MISSOURI
SOUTHERN DIVISION**

**CAROL SHULER AND ROGER
SHULER,**

Plaintiffs,

v.

JIM ARNOTT, et al.,

Defendants.

)
)
)
)
)
)
)
)
)
)
)

Case No. 6:20-cv-03281-MDH

ORDER

Before the Court is Plaintiffs’ motion for leave to file a Third Amended Complaint. Under Rule 15(a)(2) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, the court should freely grant leave to amend a pleading when justice so requires. “[T]he court has broad discretion and will only deny leave to amend in order to avoid undue delay, where there has been bad faith on the part of the plaintiff, when amendment would be futile or when amendment would result in unfair prejudice to the defendants.” *Murphy v. Engelhardt*, 2017 WL 11461047 at *1 (W.D. Mo. 2017) (citations omitted). Plaintiffs’ motion simply states that ‘[l]eave should be granted because ‘justice requires it,’ per FRCP 15.” (Doc. 183).

Plaintiffs do not articulate any reason why justice requires the Court allow them to file a Third Amended Complaint. Plaintiffs only bring the instant motion after the Court dismissed many of their claims against several defendants. Plaintiffs apparently believe that “justice requires” them to once more amend their Complaint for no other reason than that they believe the Court should not have dismissed any of their claims. Plaintiffs have had more than adequate opportunity to plead their claims. In this case, justice requires the Court to not grant Plaintiffs leave to file an amended complaint. Plaintiffs’ motion (Doc. 183) is **DENIED**.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: March 22, 2022

/s/ Douglas Harpool
DOUGLAS HARPOOL
United States District Judge